

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/690,289	10/21/2003	Sheila Shaw	SS-101.P.1	4575
24232	7590 04/06/2006		EXAM	INER
DAVID R PRESTON & ASSOCIATES APC			HAYES, MICHAEL J	
SUITE 205	BLUFF DRIVE		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SAN DIEGO	SAN DIEGO, CA 92130			
			DATE MAILED: 04/06/200	6

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
	10/690,289	SHAW, SHEILA					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Michael J. Hayes	3767					
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 16(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tirr iill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	I.  lely filed  the mailing date of this communication.  D (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 Ja	nuary 2006.						
	action is non-final.						
·—	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
closed in accordance with the practice under E	_						
Disposition of Claims							
4)⊠ Claim(s) 10 and 12-19 is/are pending in the application.							
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>10 and 12-19</u> is/are rejected.							
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.						
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·							
Application Papers							
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine							
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on 21 October 2003 is/are:	a)⊠ accepted or b)☐ objected	to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	•						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign  a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents  2. Certified copies of the priority documents  3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior  application from the International Bureau  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati ity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage					
Attachment(s)							
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary						
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/23/06.	Paper No(s)/Mail Double of Informal F	ate Patent Application (PTO-152)					

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

### Withdrawal of Allowability

The indication of the allowability of claim 10 in the last office action is withdrawn in view of the rejections below.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over LEONE in view of .

Leone discloses a security band having an endless band made of elastic (col. 1, ll. 36-39) and inelastic material (i.e., cotton; see col. 3, ll. 11-17) and a retaining pocket of inelastic material attached to the inner surface of the elastic band. The band is capable of accepting a peritoneal dialysis catheter because of its pocket. Leone teaches placing the endless band around different portions of a person's body (e.g., the thigh and head) to locate a pocket at the desired position on a person's body. To place the continuous elastic band in place, it would be stretched and a portion of a person's body would be placed through the elastic band. Leone further discloses sliding the endless band to a location ending at about the waist or hips of an individual because the location on the thigh would be considered about the waist or hips. See figs. 1, 4, 6, 7. Leone does not disclose inserting the external portion of a peritoneal catheter in the retaining

Page 3

Art Unit: 3767

pocket. Sutherland discloses a peritoneal catheter security band made from washable elastic (i.e., lycra; 3:65 - 4:5) and inelastic material (col. 4, ll. 6-17, 26-35) having an inside pocket, positioning the band and pocket at a person's waist, and placing a peritoneal catheter into the pocket (figs. 1, 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the teachings of Sutherland in the invention and method of Leone in order to assist patients having peritoneal catheters to hold the catheters close to their waist in a comfortable manner.

## **Double Patenting**

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 10-19 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 2 of copending Application No. 10/894135 and further in view of LEONE and SUTHERLAND. Application '135 recites an elastic band not detachable (i.e., endless), a medical device retaining pocket on the inside of the band. Though not reciting the method of positioning the band on a patient and inserting a peritoneal catheter in the pocket, prior art Leone and Sutherland disclose these recited

Application/Control Number: 10/690,289

Art Unit: 3767

limitations, as discussed above. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at

the time of the invention to use the teachings of Leone and Sutherland with the recited medical

security band recited in application '135 in order to assist patients having peritoneal catheters to

hold the catheters close to their waist in a comfortable manner.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting

claims have not in fact been patented.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Michael Hayes at (571) 272-4959. The examiner can usually be

reached Monday -Thursday, 7:00-4:30, and on alternate Fridays. The fax number for submitting

official papers is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

1 April 2006

MyHayer

Page 4